

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

2-22-2011

### February 22, 2011

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 22, 2011" (2011). *Minutes*. 11.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/11](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/11)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

<b>FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 22 February 2011 (Vol. XXXIV, No. 11)</b>
---

The 2010 – 2011 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at:  
<http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

**I. Call to order by Chair John Pommier at 2:00pm.** (Booth Library Conference Room)

Present: A. Adom, J. Best, J. Coit, T. Leonce, A. Methven, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, J. Pommier, J. Stowell, L. Taylor, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington, J. Prillaman. Excused: M. Fero, F. Mullins, L. Taylor

Guests: Mike Cornebise (Geology/Geography, CASL), Karla Sanders (CASA/CASL); Grant Sterling (Philosophy/CAA), Barbara Burke (Director, Division of Intercollegiate Athletics); Cindy Tozer (DIA); Jennifer Brown (DEN)

**II. Approval of the Minutes of 8 February**

Senator Viertel (White) moved to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

**III. Announcements**

a. CORE – Faculty Senate Retention Forum, 8 March 2011, 2:30 – 3:30 p.m., Arcola-Tuscola Room (MLK Union)

**IV. Communications**

- a. Email of 8 February, from Steve Rich, re: Faculty/Staff Campaign
- b. Email of 11 February, from John Best, re: Campus Master Plan Timeline: Nursing
- c. Email of 14 February, from Lisa Taylor, re: Interview for AVP - ITS
- d. Email of 17 February, from Dean Augustine, re: IRB Appointment

**V. Old Business**

**A. Committee Reports**

1. Executive Committee: Chair Pommier stated that the Senate meeting regarding Disability Services has been moved to April 5.

2. Nominations Committee: Senator Methven stated he would submit a list of nominated positions to Senate at the next meeting.

Senator Best stated that Dean Augustine had established an alternative process for selecting faculty representatives for the Institutional Review Board. Senator Best (Viertel) moved to strike Institutional Review Board from the list of Senate nominated position in section II.B.2 of the bylaws. Motion passed unanimously. Abstain: Adom.

3. Elections Committee: Vice Chair Mulvaney stated that nominations are due Friday, March 4 by 4pm. The list of candidates will be published in our March 8 minutes, the elections will be March 29-30, and results will be presented to Senate April 8.

4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: Senator White stated that Student Senator Ryan Larimore wanted to ask the Faculty Senate what the Student Senate could do to advocate academics, referring to the balance between academic and athletic funding. He had asked because Student Senate allocated \$1500 to send our basketball team to the OVC tournament. He wanted to know if we had some ideas for the Student Senate to allocate money for academics. White asked Senators to submit ideas to him and he would pass them on to the Senate.

5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: no report.

6. Awards Committee: Stowell stated that the deadline for Distinguished Faculty Award nominations is Friday, March 4. We are still waiting to hear back from the Alumni Association and Student Senate to constitute the committee.

7. Faculty Forum Committee: Senator Padmaraju stated that Karla Sanders requested we help spread the word about the forum on retention.

8. Other Reports

**a. Provost's Report**

Lord stated that the first candidate for the Assistant Vice President/ITS position is visiting today from Trenton College, there are three other candidates coming, the one that was originally scheduled to be here Thursday and Friday took another job. The three other candidates include one internal candidate.

Encourage anyone who is interested to take part. For the Dean of Lumpkin College position, five people were interviewed and one of them had already taken another job. Lord stated he has met with the search committee and is reviewing the candidates. For the Assistant Vice President/CATS position, that search is underway but no interviews have been scheduled yet. The last search is to identify an interim Dean for the College of Sciences, and Lord asks faculty to submit feedback on the candidates.

Lord stated that he thanks Senate for supporting the forum in two weeks, retention and recruitment are two watchwords now. We will be talking about retention in a variety of places this semester, and not just at the forum.

Lord stated that the talkback sessions for Faculty Development, by college, have started. The session for CEPS was held recently, there are another one or two of them this week, and one the following weeks. We are in a period of transition, and lots of feedback is helpful.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: no report.

c. Other: Chair Pommier reported on the work of the Identification Protection Committee regarding protection of Social Security numbers, and asked if there are any unique situations where these numbers are exposed, and asked faculty to contact him if they have any examples. He noted that changing from mechanical to electronic locks on some buildings and rooms is being discussed, because available records indicate that many keys have been issued and not returned.

Pommier stated that Strategic Planning is continuing, and right now the committee is focusing on training techniques. He stated that the consultant for the process will cost roughly \$44,000, and that the committee will do much of the work, which may result in some savings. He asked faculty to contact him if they have any concerns or comments on the process.

Best stated that was presenting to Senate a report laying out the timeline of the process that put Nursing in the Physical Science Building in the most recent Master Plan Update. After our last Senate meeting I informed Provost Lord and Dean Hanner and they would have a chance to respond before you read the report. One of the things they reported is that if there could be more depth in the minutes of the steering committee we would see that there was more discussion of the move of Nursing than was reflected in the minutes. They also agreed there that what they read was an accurate accounting of the information that I did have. Best stated he wished the Senate would consider a motion to accept the report without their endorsement.

Senator Methven (?) moved to accept the report without endorsement. Pommier stated that minutes are critical for reflecting accurately what was debated, and should be more detailed. Viertel stated that he appreciated Best's effort in putting together the report, and that he was cognizant of taking into account the feelings of different departments. Pommier asked for clarification on Dean Hanner's comment in the report that the final open campus meeting of the Master Plan update committee was "not the place or the time" to ask questions about the decision to move Nursing into the Physical Sciences building. Stowell stated that he attended a number of the Campus Master Plan meetings discussed in the report and was cited as verifying some elements of the timeline. Best stated that he did not attend the final open Master Plan meeting, because he believed that the migration patterns had been settled. Best stated that it is possible that Hanner might have wanted to avoid spending the entire meeting discussing that one issue. Methven asked if the motion was necessary to have a motion to place the report in the minutes. Pommier suggested the matter be tabled for until March 22. Best (Viertel) moved to table the motion until March 22. Motion was approved unanimously.

## **B. Other Old Business**

## **VI. New Business**

A. Athletics: Barbara Burke, Director of Athletics, Cindy Tozer, Director of Academic Services

Burke described the academic process is in the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics. Burke stated that in January I meet with all the athletes, talk about students' GPAs, and introduce students that do well in the classroom. One of our goals is to have a 3.0 average GPA every semester. In fall 2010 the men's team had a 3.0, while women's teams usually have 3.2-3.3. The highest teams are the women's cross country team (3.59) and men's golf team (3.49), but Burke stated comparing team GPAs is not fair to teams with large numbers of athletes and they are currently calculating the percentage increases for each team.

Burke discussed graduation rate data from the Division, which include not only comparisons to Conference institutions, but also other institutions in the state. DIA also calculates graduation success rate, which calculated differently than NCAA. The NCAA graduation rates includes athletes who transfer, to other institutions, and the EIU figure doesn't penalize you for athletes that leave and go somewhere else. GSR is a truer picture. EIU graduation numbers are either higher than or comparable to other institutions in the state and the OVC.

Burke stated that the NCAA requires programs maintain a rating of 925 Academic Progress Rate points, earned for maintaining eligibility and retention, which is intended to stop coaches from running kids out of the program rather than helping them achieve academic success. Burke stated that for APR Eastern is doing fine. The only concern on the 2009-2010 report, was men's tennis had an 846 APR. The tennis team has only 7 men, and the rating was the result of an athlete leaving the program ineligible. Burke stated that she and Tozer respond to low ratings by developing a plan for that sport, for recruitment and retention. The overall score for the year was 939, which is just fine, but could be better.

Burke showed the Senate her report on Honors students. Out of about 450 athletes, 47 participate in honors program, honors students are present on 18 of 21 teams. 28 students received the OVC medal of honor for a 4.0 GPA, and Megan Gingerich, a track and cross country athlete, was named scholar athlete of the year for OVC.

Senator Best asked Burke for the total number of student athletes, and if the number is comparable to peer institutions. Burke stated that there are about 450 student athletes, and quite a few more than peer institutions, and EIU has the highest number of sports sponsored in the OVC, at 21. Other schools average 17. Best asked if EIU has a high percentage of students with athletic scholarships. Burke stated that EIU doesn't have a high percentage of full scholarships. EIU spends approximately \$3.2-3.3 million for aid to athletes, but those students are spending that much and more.

Burke stated that the committee reviewing Eastern's NCAA recertification met last week, but has not announced their findings yet.

Burke also discussed the DIA's master plan for athletic facilities. She stated the facilities plan was borne out of a 5-year strategic plan, and both are available on the website. She urged faculty to send her any and all questions about that plan. Burke stated that there is a correlation between the success of student athletes and recruitment. You have to recruit student-athletes that can be successful at Eastern. When athletes are being recruited and come to campus they are comparing Eastern against other institutions, our locker room to other locker room, our venue to other venue. They compare academics, they look and compare the physical nature look at our facilities. Our competition for recruitment are the Missouri valley schools, and that presents a problem. Compared to those schools we are a little below the standard. All of our proposed facility projects really elevate our programs. We lack practice facilities, locker room facilities, some sports don't have lockers. Burke stated that DIA is aware that there are other mission critical issues on this campus, we understand that, but the plan was devised to spell out how do we improve the athletics program.

Senator Stowell asked what happens to grade report after faculty submit them. Burke stated that Tozer and her staff follow up with coaches and meet with students. She stated that it really is important that we get those reports. Those grade and attendance reports are really critical to getting our students to succeed. Stowell asked if students with academic difficulties are referred to the student success center. Tozer stated that she does mention their services.

Adom commended the DIA on their success in academics. Burke: stated that congratulations should also go to the coaches, who are sending the message that academics are important. Methven stated that he has always been very impressed when I have athletes they are truly student-athletes. When I send reports to Cindy and she follows up, if I have a student who's missing class and I report that, the student is in my office the next day.

Pommier agreed that academic success is being emphasized by coaches and asked if the DIA has any data on retention rates before you had this process or before the academic success center. Cindy stated that she thinks APR is a good reflection of retention. Our athletes are well above that minimum standard. We're probably in the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. Pommier said that the best students in his courses are your students, they are in the front seats, they are the ones asking questions.

B. Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL): Karla Sanders, Director of Center for Academic Support and Assessment (CASA); Mike Cornebise, (Chair of Geology/Geography), Chair of CASL

Sanders discussed the Electronic Writing Portfolio, stating that it is assessed in a couple of different ways. First, by a holistic rubric that's applied by faculty to the paper. The majority of the students are getting a 3.5, 29% earn 3, and 27% receive 4. Less than 10% of papers receive below a 3. When we made the changes to the EWP we knew that students would start submitting papers from courses not Writing Centered or Writing Intensive, but we are still receiving 71% of papers from WI/WC courses. Second, a committee of volunteer faculty members reads a percentage of completed portfolios, and looking at seven different traits. In addition to the data, readers give ideas about how to improve writing. Readers have suggested that assignments ask students to write for audiences other than their professor. Readers have also found that portfolios are generally weak in critical thinking, analysis, creating arguments, and supporting arguments. Readers have also suggested students be required to identify and correct their own grammar mistakes.

Sanders stated that for the first year we have data from the voluntary system of accountability, the National Survey of Student Engagement. Eastern participated in the annual NSSE assessment last spring, with about 350 freshmen and 590 seniors. 79% indicated they are "very much" or "quite a bit" expected to write clearly and effectively, which is a little above other Illinois institutions and the national figures.

Sanders stated that in the Collegiate Learning Assessment, which tests critical thinking, results were less than we had hoped for. Our seniors were 24% below and 38% well below where the CLA thought they should be based on ACT scores and freshman scores. The test compares 100 freshmen and 100 seniors.

Cornebise stated that the report indicates we are graduating seniors who are markedly improved in public speaking. Seniors are tested in Senior seminar, and almost 60% were found to be highly competent, and 97% are competent speakers. Only 25% of entering freshmen are rated highly competent, and 59% are rated competent. The percentage of students rated minimally competent and not competent have dropped. The report shows quite a bit of improvement over time.

Cornebise stated one measurement issue is that students in Communications 1310 (a freshman class) are required to cite 5 peer reviewed sources verbally, but that's not a requirement in oral presentations in Senior Seminar, and a subcommittee which includes Richard Jones from that department is trying to iron out some of the differences in that assessment.

Sanders stated that results from the Watson-Glaser test, which is a norm referenced assessment of critical thinking, given in all senior seminars, shows a slight downward trend, and this indicates we have some work to do. Results show that each college displays a similar trajectory for the senior student body. Eastern students self-report for the NSSE assessment, and there 88% students said EIU courses had quite a bit or very much to critical thinking. The issue was the Collegiate Learning Assessment where students had to perform.

Cornebise stated that assessment of Global Citizenship is done during debut for freshmen, and in senior seminar for seniors. These data show the greatest shift. For the statement, I consider myself to be a leader, 30% of seniors chose "strongly agree," compared to 18% of freshman. For I am confident in my abilities, 38% seniors of seniors stated they strongly agree, compared with 22% of freshman. For the statement, I am willing to disagree in public with peers, 52% of seniors chose strongly agree, compared with 19% of freshman. For the statement, it is important to promote racial and ethnic understanding freshman chose strongly agree 32%, while 45% of seniors strongly agreed. For the statement, I am willing to reduce personal use of resources, freshmen chose undecided 32% of the time, while only 12% of seniors did.

Senator White asked if the readers for the portfolios are representative of faculty across campus. Sanders stated that the readers are faculty from all colleges. There were 23 readers last fall, and they are pretty evenly split within colleges. The larger report has a list of readers and their home departments. Every 2-3 years we do a training and I send out a call, and one was last fall. All that we really ask is that they teach undergraduate courses at Eastern. The training is done in one day.

White asked how the 100 seniors who took the CLA were selected. Sanders stated they are selected based on criteria that the CLA gives us, the Provost gives us a list of students that meet the criteria, and we solicit volunteers in senior seminars. Students who took the CLA did not take Watson-Glazer. It is not a scientific representative sample, for example students must be native to Eastern. Adom asked if the same criteria applied for the 100 freshman chosen. Sanders stated that the only criteria is that students had to be new freshman, and they could have only 6 or less hours of college credit. It is given in a 3 week period in the fall to new freshmen.

Vice-Chair Mulvaney asked if there has been discussions about the validity of the CLA, from what I've been told by others with experience, there are issues with finding a valid critical thinking assessment. Sanders stated we have had issues with instruments for critical thinking since we've been assessing critical thinking. She stated that faculty may remember we used to give the ETS Tasks assessment which was to write something, the Watson-Glazer is fill in the bubble after students read something. The Committee felt that Watson-Glazer was closest to what we were trying to assess at Eastern at this time, but we are looking at other instruments, or other ways to assess critical thinking for rubrics or portfolios. We didn't want to not assess CT while we were looking for a good instrument. I'm a big fan of criterion-based assessments, and Watson-Glazer is norm referenced, and it has its limitations. By no means is this the only way these things are being assessed at EIU. Best stated that Watson-Glazer is a widely used device and offers a benchmark to make comparisons directly with other institutions. The reliability isn't questioned, so when you see a trend line it's going to show there's an issue. It doesn't help with making the inference about what the intervention is, you said we have work to do. Sanders stated that the composite test doesn't say this is what you've got to do. For writing and speaking assessments, the rubrics were designed by Communications Studies and English, and we've got readers who say, this is what we've got to do. We don't have Watson-Glazer saying "you people need to work on inference." We know what the test covers but what we don't have are the next steps. All these suggest we need to do something on critical thinking. A few years ago, we brought experts on critical thinking to campus, in conjunction with faculty development, and talked about designing assignments and syllabi to promote critical thinking. Leonce stated that she is concerned about the validity of the test in her senior seminar. She stated she's noticed senior fatigue. Students don't recognize the validity of the test, and they ask about how the test will affect their careers. The speaking assessments directly affects their grade, but with the Watson-Glazer they all ask, how does this affect my grade. Sanders stated that CASL knows about these issues, and is considering more course based objectives for assessing critical thinking.

Stowell asked if the Watson-Glazer scores, were adjusted for ACT scores, and asked if our ACT scores are changing. Sanders stated they are not significantly changing, the average ACT dropped from 22 to 21. Stowell stated that since the Watson-Glazer is given in senior seminar, it includes transfers whose ACT scores are not reflected in the freshman average. Viertel stated that since there's no baseline assessment of freshman, we may be improving their thinking, and the test just shows they started a lower level. Sanders stated that CASL couldn't think of a way to embed the assessment without imposing on someone's courses. We built the senior seminars to have space for the assessments, and went from 2 to 3 credit hours as a result. The CLA does adjust for changes in ACT scores. Based on the expectations, it indicated our students should be higher at the senior level based on what they were at freshman level.

Adom asked how Eastern compares to peer institutions. Sanders stated that all we have is NSSE, and the CLA data gives us a scatter plot so we know the scores from a number of institutions that have taken the CLA. The Voluntary System of Accountability will tell us more but no one has their scores up yet. One reason the President's Council wanted to be part of the VSA was because it would give comparisons. The deadline for data is next year. Because we use so many homegrown instruments we only have our own data. There's a nice fat binder of NSSE data if anyone want to look at it, have freshman data as well as seniors.

**VII. Adjournment at 4:00pm**

**Future Agenda items:**

Committee on Retention Efforts forum March 8, 2pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit  
March 6, 2011